

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action mailed November 24, 2010.

In the Office Action, the Examiner has allowed claims 13, 18, and 44, objected to claims 10, 22, 24, 30, 38, and 43, and rejected claims 8, 9, 11, 12, 15-17, 20, 21, 23, 28-29, 31-37, and 39-42 under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Applicant has amended independent claims 8, 11, 15, 16, 20, 28, 31, and 41 to clarify embodiments of the invention.

Reconsideration in light of the amendments and remarks made herein is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

Claims 12, 31-37, and 39-42 stand rejected under 35 USC § 103 as being allegedly obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,421,527 issued to DeMartin et al. (hereinafter DeMartin), U.S. Patent No. 5,216,692 issued to Ling (hereinafter Ling), U.S. Patent No. 6,285,886 issued to Kamel et al. (hereinafter Kamel) U.S. Patent No. 6,856,812 issued to Budka et al. (hereinafter Budka), and U.S. Patent No. 6,865,393 issued to Baum et al. (hereinafter Baum).

Claims 8-9, 11, 15-17, 20-21, 23, and 28-29 stand rejected under 35 USC § 103, as being allegedly obvious over U.S. Patent No. 5,905,742 issued to Chennakeshu et al. (hereinafter Chennakeshu), Kamel, Ling, Budak, and Baum.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant gratefully acknowledges that independent claims 13, 18, and 44 are in condition for allowance.

Applicant further gratefully acknowledges the Examiner's indication that dependent claims 10, 22, 24, 30, 38, and 43 are objected to for being dependent upon rejected base claims, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Although Applicant respectfully disagrees with many of the Office Action's rejections, in order to expedite prosecution of the pending case, Applicant has generally rewritten the objected

to dependent claims as independent claims 8, 20, 11, 28, 31, and 41, respectively, in order to gain allowance of these claims. Independent claims 8, 20, 11, 28, 31, and 41 therefore basically contain the same limitations as objected to claims 10, 22, 24, 30, 38, and 43, respectively. Moreover, Applicant has amended independent 15 and 16 to include limitations similar to those related to the objected to dependent claims. Therefore, amended independent 15 and 16 should be allowable for at least the same reasons.

Additionally, because the independent claims are generally rewritten versions of the objected claims in independent form with basically the same limitations and being generally of the same scope, respectively, they have not been narrowed within the meaning of *Festo*.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that rewritten independent claims 8, 11, 15, 16, 20, 28, 31, and 41 and their respective dependent claims are now in condition for allowance.

Application No. 10/084,019
Amendment dated February 24, 2011
Reply to Office Action of 11/24/2010

CONCLUSION

In light of the amendments contained herein, Applicants submit that the application is in condition for allowance, for which early action is requested.

Please charge any fees or overpayments that may be due with this response to Deposit Account No. 17-0026.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 2/23/2011

By: /Won Tae C. Kim/
Won Tae Kim, Reg. #40,457
(858) 651-6295

QUALCOMM Incorporated
Attn: Patent Department
5775 Morehouse Drive
San Diego, California 92121-1714
Telephone: (858) 658-2426
Facsimile: (858) 658-2502